

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

FREDERICK BANKS, <i>et al.</i>,	:	CIVIL NO. 1:19-CV-1102
	:	
Petitioners	:	(Chief Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
CHINA, <i>et al.</i>,	:	
	:	
Respondents	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 2nd day of August, 2019, upon consideration of petitioner’s motion (Doc. 5) to vacate the court order dismissing his habeas petition for lack of standing,¹ and the court construing the instant motion as a motion for reconsideration, and it appearing that petitioner fails to demonstrate reliance on one of three major grounds needed for a proper motion for reconsideration, North River Ins. Co. v. Cigna Reinsurance Co., 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995) (stating three major grounds include “(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence [not available previously]; [or], (3) the need to correct clear error [of law] or prevent manifest injustice.”), but, instead, simply disagrees

¹ The court dismissed, for lack of standing, the habeas petition filed on behalf of thousands of Muslims detained in China “vocational camps”, prisoners detained in Egypt without medical care, and Augusta, Georgia grade schoolers. (Doc. 3).

with the court's disposition of this matter,² see Waye v. First Citizen's Nat'l Bank, 846 F. Supp. 310, 314 (M.D. Pa. 1994) (finding that "[a] motion for reconsideration is not to be used to reargue matters already argued and disposed of."), aff'd, 31 F.3d 1174 (3d Cir. 1994); see also Database America, Inc. v. Bellsouth Adver. & Publ'g Corp., 825 F. Supp. 1216, 1220 (D.N.J. 1993) (citations omitted) (holding "[a] party seeking reconsideration must show more than a disagreement with the Court's decision, and 'recapitulation of the cases and arguments considered by the court before rendering its original decision fails to carry the moving party's burden.'"), it is hereby ORDERED that petitioner's motion (Doc. 5) is DENIED.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania

² Petitioner urges the court to reconsider its decision dismissing his habeas petition, and claims that the court order is invalid because it does not contain an official seal of the Judge or Clerk of Court, the court did not apply the American Indian canons of construction, and because the United States Marshal Service did not serve the order. (Doc. 5). Petitioner fails to advance an intervening change in controlling law, or to present newly found evidence. Nor does he establish that the court came to its conclusions by way of some gross misunderstanding of the facts or law of this case.